

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED FEEDBACK
ON NONVERBAL PERFORMANCE BEHAVIOR
IN INSTRUCTIONAL THEATRE AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL**

GLENDAL EEE SULLIVAN

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED FEEDBACK
ON NONVERBAL PERFORMANCE BEHAVIOR
IN INSTRUCTIONAL THEATRE AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

An Abstract
Presented to the
Graduate and Research Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Glenda Lee Sullivan

July 1990

This study was made to determine the effectiveness of videotaped feedback on nonverbal performance behavior in instructional theatre at the high school level.

Four casts of high school students preparing plays were involved in the study. The use of videotaped feedback and/or director notes was manipulated in the experiment. This study ascertained that a combination of videotaped feedback and the director's oral notes is effective as a training tool in instructional theatre at the high school level, resulting in statistically significant improvements in a later evaluation of nonverbal performance behavior during a second rehearsal attempt. Students who received no videotaped feedback or director notes scored significantly lower in a later evaluation of a second rehearsal attempt. The study also found that following a combination of videotaped feedback and oral notes, students' self-evaluations moved closer to the director's evaluation than they had previously been. These student evaluations following the combination of videotaped feedback and oral notes moved significantly closer to the director's evaluation than did the evaluations of students who received oral notes alone. In a comparison of effectiveness in improving later performances among the methods tested, the

study also discovered that none of the methods--director notes, videotaped feedback, or a combination of the two--was superior. However, each of the three methods was statistically significantly better than no method at all.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED FEEDBACK
ON NONVERBAL PERFORMANCE BEHAVIOR
IN INSTRUCTIONAL THEATRE AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

A Thesis
Presented to the
Graduate and Research Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Glenda Lee Sullivan
July 1990

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

PAGE

1.	Student Evaluation Before and After With Director Evaluation Before and After in the Four Groups.....	26
2.	Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test of Differences In Directors' First Evaluations With Students' Evaluations Before and After Manipulation.....	28
3.	Comparison of Alignment of Directors' and Students' Ratings by Groups in Sets of Two.....	30
4.	Wilcoxon Test of Directors' Evaluations After Manipulation With Evaluations Before Manipulation.....	32
5.	Comparison of Effectiveness of Methods In Improving Second Rehearsal Attempts.....	33
6.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups I and II.....	53
7.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups I and III.....	53


To the Graduate and Research Council:

I am submitting herewith a Thesis written by Glenda Lee Sullivan entitled "The Effectiveness of Videotaped Feedback in Instructional Theatre at the High School Level." I have examined the final copy of this paper for form and content, and I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Mass Communication and Theatre.



Major Professor

We have read this Thesis and
recommend its acceptance:


Second Committee Member


Third Committee Member

Accepted for the Graduate and
Research Council:


Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Joe Filippo, Mr. Gary Harris, and Dr. Ellen Kanervo, professors of Speech, Communication and Theatre, Austin Peay State University, for their professional insights, guidance and valuable time during this entire study.

Gratitude is expressed to Mr. John Griffin and Mr. Gary Harris, together with their casts, for their aid in pre-testing and refining the research procedures and evaluation instrument used in this study.

Appreciation is expressed to the high school theatre directors and their students for their participation in this project. The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Mr. Randall Sullivan, Dickson County High School, Mr. Richard Bunton, Montgomery Central High School, and Mrs. Lee Ellen Beach, Northeast High School.

Additionally, the author wishes to thank Randall Sullivan for his immeasurable patience, constant understanding, and endless support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Problem and Its Significance.....	1
Statement of the Study's Purpose.....	3
Definition of Primary Concept.....	3
Justification for the Study.....	6
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	7
Literature of Videotaped Feedback.....	7
Literature of Directing and Theatre Arts.....	9
Literature of Nonverbal Research.....	11
3. HYPOTHESES.....	13
Statement of Hypotheses and Rationale.....	13
4. METHODOLOGY.....	19
Purpose of the Experiment.....	19
Research Procedures.....	19
Identification of Subjects.....	19
Design of the Experimental Study.....	20
Instrumentation.....	20
Experimental Treatment.....	22
Method of Statistical Analysis.....	24
Limitations of the Study.....	25
5. RESULTS.....	26

CHAPTER	PAGE
6. CONCLUSION.....	35
Discussion.....	35
Implications for High School Theatre	
Directors.....	38
Recommendations for Future Research.....	39
REFERENCES.....	41
APPENDIX A.....	44
APPENDIX B.....	52

8.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups I and IV.....	54
9.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups II and III.....	54
10.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups II and IV.....	55
11.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups III and IV.....	55
12.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement Between Groups I and II.....	56
13.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement Between Groups I and III.....	56
14.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement Between Groups I and IV.....	57
15.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement Between Groups II and III.....	57
16.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement Between Groups II and IV.....	58
17.	Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement Between Groups III and IV.....	58

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

One of the most frustrating aspects of directing instructional theatre at the high school level is that, no matter how many years one works in a single location, the majority of students involved in play production probably will be novice actors. When a director has worked with a student for a maximum of three or four years, the young actor graduates, and the director starts anew with another inexperienced actor. The director may even initiate this cycle with each production. If the school completes two productions each year, the actor must learn a tremendous amount in only a few productions. For this reason, a high school director wants to make rehearsal as effective as possible.

Because student actors frequently are inexperienced or immature, it may be difficult for them to understand or take direction from a director's notes. They often lack objectivity, and they may have problems accepting criticism. Unable to evaluate their own efforts because of their youth and lack of experience, they may not respond to the director's suggestions.

The Problem and Its Significance

High school instructional theatre should "show students how to engage in . . . examination of . . . performances.

The ability to examine a performance . . . at a number of levels or from a range of vantage points" is included by The College Board's report, Academic Preparation In the Arts, as a necessary skill (Herbert 23).

The report states that "effective interaction between the director and the actor is crucial to the success of a theatrical production" (Herbert 34). A director must discover effective methods of instructing and guiding actors in order to ensure the success of a theatrical production.

What can instructors in theatre arts do to increase their effectiveness? With the rising availability of affordable videocameras capable of recording images of high quality, directors can now capture rehearsals on videotape. Videotaped feedback may provide directors with a useful method of developing the actors' abilities to evaluate and analyze their own performances. By studying a videotape of rehearsal, student actors can be given the opportunity to examine their own presentations. As student actors gain the ability to examine their own works critically, their abilities to perform should be enhanced. These enhanced abilities should, in turn, benefit the entire production. Personal experience with videotaped feedback in the rehearsal stage leads this researcher to believe this to be true in areas of nonverbal performance behavior.

Statement of the Study's Purpose

This study will attempt to determine the effectiveness of videotaped feedback and/or directors' oral notes in improving nonverbal performance behavior and in altering the students' evaluations of their own performances. Analysis will involve high school students and their directors during the rehearsal stage of instructional theatre.

The areas to be explored in this study concern the performance behaviors of individual students. The use of videotaped feedback and/or director notes will be manipulated in the experiment, and students will be rated on improvement of nonverbal performance behavior based on the directors' criteria. The first and second student evaluations will be compared to the first director evaluation. If the second student evaluation is more closely aligned to the first director evaluation, then the manipulation will have been effective. The study will also compare each director's first evaluation with the same director's second evaluation, and student improvement will be shown by higher ratings on the second evaluation. Lastly, the study will seek to determine which of the experimental treatments caused the greatest improvement in ratings to examine its effectiveness as a teaching tool.

Definition of Primary Concept

The primary concept for this research study is nonverbal performance behavior in the production of theatrical material. Nonverbal communication typically

means any form of communication that is not achieved through words between people who are in each other's presence. This could include several areas not covered in the concept for this study: interpersonal distance, touch, smell, and "aspects of spoken utterance, such as intonation, voice quality, and the like, that can be considered apart from the actual verbal content of what is said" (Barnouw 3: 209). For this study, nonverbal communication shall be limited to the following categories: expressive body movement and hand gestures, rapid signs of facial expression, and posture.

Each of these categories deserves further explication. Expressive body movement is a kinetic presentation of the "attitudes, emotions, intentions, [and] motivations" (Spiegel and Machotka 6) of a given character to be portrayed. It is not "functional movement, the purpose of which is to strengthen, relax and co-ordinate the body" (Allen 62). Hand gestures are actions involving the hands which send information to an audience (Morris 24). Rapid signs of facial expression include the actions produced by muscle changes (of the mouth, eyes, forehead, and other areas of the face) which express changes in mood or action (Scherer and Ekman 46). Posture refers to the physical way in which an actor holds his or her body (Snyder and Drumsta 187). "Obesity, illness, old age, strong emotion, and deformities produce obvious postural or body movement effects. Actors are expected to be able to simulate these effects or to exaggerate them for dramatic purposes, as in

the traditional roles of Falstaff, Lear, Richard III, or Camille" (Barnouw 1: 200). This leads to the explanation of the term "performance behavior."

Performance behavior refers to a particular "aesthetically marked and heightened mode of communication, framed in a special way and put on display for an audience" (Barnouw 3: 262). By involving "self-conscious manipulation of the formal features of the communicative system" (bodily activity in acting, for example), performance may be considered "formally reflexive - signification about signification" (Barnouw 3: 266). As a form of mimicry, performance behavior can be considered reflective as well.

The areas to be explored in this study concern the performance behaviors of individual students. These behaviors are those that may be determined by the individual student rather than those which are frequently developed by the director. This removes "blocking" (the patterns of movement of the actors on the stage), interpersonal distance (the spacing of individuals in relation to others), and costuming from the categories as these are often determined by the director (Ball 105-128). Also removed from the study are categories of spoken utterance and the sensations of touch and smell which are not visual in nature. Although the videotape records speech as well as movement, this study will focus only on visual aspects which can be recorded on videotape.

In every type of theatre, final decisions regarding all

characterizations must be the director's prerogative (Albright 205). These characterizations are usually developed in collaboration with the actors, rather than dictated to them. Criteria for evaluating the nonverbal performance behavior as "good" or "bad" will be established by the directors for their own groups of students, as these may change from director to director and from play to play. As the highest authority on performance behavior to whom the students are accountable, the directors must determine these criteria (Beck 12-15).

Justification for the Study

The brief time allotted to high school theatre directors and actors to prepare plays for production should be used as effectively as possible. This means that directors need to find and utilize the most constructive methods available to them to teach students while working with them to produce an artistic performance. Research in this area can help high school theatre directors to discover what methods are most effective in relation to nonverbal performance behavior.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Literature of Videotaped Feedback

Reviewing the literature of videotaped feedback began with a study of rehearsal techniques in another area of performing arts, dance. Long-established practice finds students of dance spending countless hours practicing their craft before mirrors in order to improve their performances. However, students of theatre have not been able to employ this technique in staging productions.

With the increased availability of affordable videocameras able to preserve excellent images, dance students can now capture their rehearsals and performances on videotape. The ability to replay and analyze a rehearsal or performance allows for in-depth study (Pierpont 68).

This practice of videotaping is widely used in a number of areas in which the ability to analyze behavior can enhance a participant's ability to evaluate, reproduce or improve the performance of the behavior. Some professional athletes study their performances in recorded broadcasts of their games. In order to improve athletic performances in amateur and in professional sports, coaches record athletic competitions on videotape to analyze the strengths, weaknesses, and strategies of the teams and players involved. Teachers have been videotaped to improve their

effectiveness in the classroom, particularly in areas of nonverbal behavior (Wolfgang 204). Mock interviews of potential job applicants have been recorded on videotape to help increase the skills needed to successfully complete an interview and gain employment (Schuley 2945A). A report on a behavior modeling training program designed to teach students the behaviors for doing on-the-job training revealed using videotaped feedback, along with one observer, enhanced reproduction scores (Decker 763-773).

Educators have used videocameras to record and replay student performances in a number of subject areas (Reider 14-18). The successful use of videotape playback has helped students to develop communication skills in foreign languages (Bowman 21-27) and in their native languages (Atencio 632-634).

Little research was available on the use of videotape in theatre education. One study, which used videotaped theatre scenes to measure audience response to interpersonal distance in live and in videotaped theatre scenes, stated that an implication drawn from its results was that using videotape in teaching interpersonal distance to actors would not be effective (Frantz 1853A). There were no other implications made about teaching theatre students nonverbal performance skills through videotape in any of the available literature. Another report on using videotape with theatre performance dealt with technical problems involved in taping live performances for broadcast (Wallach 26-30).

Literature of Directing and Theatre Arts

To measure accurately the effectiveness of videotaped feedback as an instructional tool for the director, one must determine the roles and the objectives of the directors and student actors of instructional theatre at the high school level. A review of the literature of directing and theatre arts provides such information.

Although interpretations of a director's function in high school instructional theatre are varied, a few general statements can be made that are widely accepted. First, whether correct or not, the director of high school theatre is the highest authority on performance behavior to whom the students are accountable (Beck 119). Second, final judgments regarding all characterizations must be the director's prerogative (Albright 205). Third, a "director is a teacher, not only of a play, but also of acting - not merely a traffic director of stage movement" (Beck 37). Fourth, the director serves as the "eyes and ears for the actor during rehearsals, when the actor has no audience other than the director" (Albright 147). Finally, high school theatre directors frequently determine "blocking" (the patterns of movement of the actors on the stage), interpersonal distance (the spacing of individuals in relation to others), and costuming for their casts (Ball 105-128).

The objectives of a high school theatre instructor are two-fold. First, as instructors in theatre arts, directors

should assist their students in making meaningful progress toward three types of abilities. According to Academic Preparation In the Arts, these are:

1. Knowledge of how to produce or perform works of art.
2. Knowledge of how to analyze, interpret, and evaluate art-works.
3. Knowledge of art-works of other periods and cultures and their contexts. (Herbert 20)

The second objective of the high school director is to develop a work of art. The director is a "collaborating artist with the playwright, actors, and designers" (Wheetley 44). Play production culminates in presentation to an audience, an audience which expects to see an artistic performance.

The roles and objectives of the student actors are also two-fold. As students, they are deeply involved in the learning process. They are becoming acquainted with "the basic vocal and physical requirements of acting; the basic techniques; and . . . method[s] of analyzing and developing characterization" (Beck 91). As actors, the students become a part of the collaborative effort to produce a work of art (Wheetley 44).

Finally, the function of rehearsal can be examined. The literature indicates that the "rehearsal period is a learning period, in that the actors are learning how the play goes, . . . what the performance will be like" (Ball

59). During this time, the director encourages "the actor's own creativity by inspiring and generating ideas" (Albright 147).

Literature of Nonverbal Research

Most helpful in refining the definition of the primary concept and in the development of research procedures has been the literature of nonverbal research. This body of literature has greatly contributed to the composition of the questionnaires for the directors and actors.

Information on various types of nonverbal behavior, such as gestures and body motion (Birdwhistell 79-82, 168-170), can be gleaned from the literature of nonverbal research. The concept of expressive body movement, including the stylized movement of dance and mime, has been researched (Spiegel and Machotka 29-61), but the implications for using videotape as an instructional tool in theatre education for improving expressive movement have not been studied.

Posture and rapid signs of facial expression are to be considered in theatre education. Actors are expected to assume postural effects appropriate to the characters they portray (Barnouw 1: 200). In order to express changes in the mood or action of a given character, an actor must simulate the facial expressions of a character. Rapid signs of facial expression include changes (that result from muscle changes) of facial appearance used to communicate changes in mood or action (Scherer and Ekman 46).

Other literature presents specific areas of nonverbal behavior research, including applications in teacher training. Teachers have been videotaped in an attempt to improve their effectiveness in the classroom (Wolfgang 204).

Scherer and Ekman's Handbook of Methods in Nonverbal Research also provides invaluable information on a number of separate research methods relevant to nonverbal behavior. Besides the methodological issues presented, the book also provides an excellent technical appendix on audiovisual recording with special attention to procedures, equipment, and troubleshooting.

In summary, although the literature of nonverbal research provides no specific research on high school instructional theatre's nonverbal performance behavior, it does provide information on research procedures, definitions of behaviors, and related studies. Together with the literature of directing and theatre arts and the literature of videotaped feedback, the literature of nonverbal research has been useful in the development of the hypotheses and methodology for this study.

CHAPTER 3

Hypotheses

Statement of Hypotheses and Rationale

From personal experience and the review of literature come the following hypotheses relating to high school students and their directors involved in the rehearsal stage of instructional theatre:

1. After the directors present oral notes to their casts, student actors evaluating their own performances will rate their nonverbal performance behaviors closer to the directors' evaluations than they did before the notes were given.

The director serves as the "eyes and ears for the actor during rehearsals, when the actor has no audience other than the director" (Albright 147). Student actors at the high school level often lack the maturity, experience, and objectivity to evaluate their own performances as the director or an audience might evaluate them. Through oral notes, the director encourages "the actor's own creativity by inspiring and generating ideas" (Albright 147), and this should alter the students' perceptions of their performances.

2. Following videotaped feedback, student actors evaluating their own performances will rate their nonverbal performance behavior closer to the director's evaluation than they did before the feedback.

3. This rating will be closer to the director's evaluation than the group's rating which followed director notes only.

When directors give notes, their success in altering the actor's performance depends largely upon how well they communicate their concepts to their actors and their crews (Albright 5). It can be difficult for an inexperienced or immature actor to accept the suggestions of a director because the student is unable to visualize the problem, the "stage picture," or the overall concept from the audience's viewpoint. A student actor is involved in the process of gaining the experience and objectivity needed in order to visualize from that viewpoint. Reports have concluded that education majors who receive videotaped feedback can improve their teaching skills (Rogers 64-67). Likewise, seeing the performances from the perspective of the director or an audience should allow the students to be more objective in their judgments and more aware of their behaviors. Increased awareness from a more objective viewpoint should cause the second evaluation made by the student to coincide more closely to the director's evaluation.

4. Following a combination of director notes and videotaped feedback, student actors evaluating their own performances will rate their nonverbal performance behavior closer to the director's evaluation than they did before the notes and feedback.

5. This rating will be closer to the director's evaluation than the groups' ratings which followed either method by itself.

Allowing student actors to watch the videotape should increase their objectivity in judgment and awareness of behavior as is explained in connection with the previous hypotheses. By combining the two methods, the student not only gains increased awareness and heightened objectivity, but the student also benefits from the maturity and experience of the director. Directors could point out specific behaviors for praise or criticism. With the addition of these factors, the actor's evaluation should reflect that of the director more closely than with either method alone. In a comparable experiment which used videotaped feedback to teach college students behaviors for doing on-the-job training, results revealed that videotaped feedback combined with one observer improved reproduction scores (Decker 763-773).

6. When the selected scene is performed following the director's oral notes, the ratings made by the director will be higher than those made by the same director on the first evaluation.

"The director is a teacher, not only of a play, but also of acting - not merely a traffic director of stage movement. An organized director creates an atmosphere in which participants can learn about the craft of acting and the production of good dramatic literature" (Beck 37). For this reason, a director gives notes, and the actor who accepts the suggestions of the director and employs them should receive a higher rating from the director after adjustments based on the notes have been made.

7. When the selected scene is performed following videotaped feedback, the ratings made by the director will be higher than those made by the same director on the first evaluation.

8. Improvement indicated by higher ratings in the director's second evaluation will be greater than the improvement indicated in the second evaluation of the director who gave notes only.

Education majors who study videotapes of their performances can make necessary corrections because they see

themselves as the student sees them (Rogers 64-67). Similarly, student actors who study videotapes of their performances should be able to change because they see themselves as the audience or a director will see them. Changes made by the actors should result in higher ratings after videotaped feedback than after notes because the students can more clearly see the effects of their behaviors.

9. When the selected scene is performed following a combination of director notes and videotaped feedback, the ratings made by the director will be higher than those made by the same director on the first evaluation.

10. Improvement indicated by higher ratings in the director's second evaluation will be greater than the improvement indicated in the second evaluations of the directors who used either method by itself.

If directors share their backgrounds, maturity, and knowledge with the casts of high school productions while both groups observe a videotape of rehearsal, the actors can gain from this experience. Opportunities taken by the directors to point out specific areas for praise should encourage young actors to repeat positive behaviors. Areas which need improvement can be highlighted, and even re-played, to guide the student actors to create their own suggestions and to make corrections. Adjustments should

result in greater improvements after the combination than after either method alone because the actors profit from increased perception, heightened objectivity, and the directors' insights.

CHAPTER 4

Methodology

Purpose of the Experiment

The purpose of the experiment was to investigate the effectiveness of videotaped feedback and/or director's notes in altering the students' evaluations of their own performances and in altering their nonverbal performance behavior. The first and second student evaluations were compared to the first director evaluation. If the second evaluation was more closely aligned to the director's first evaluation, then the experimental treatment was effective. The study also compared each director's first evaluation with the director's second evaluation, and student improvement was indicated by higher ratings on the second evaluation. The study also attempted to ascertain which of the methods of directing caused the greatest improvement in ratings to analyze its effectiveness as a teaching tool.

Research Procedures

Identification of Subjects

The data were collected from groups of high school students and their directors involved in preparing plays for production at Dickson County High School, Dickson, Tennessee, Northeast High School, Clarksville, Tennessee, and Montgomery Central High School, Cunningham, Tennessee. There were four plays being prepared: Harvey, Twelve Angry

Jurors, The Swimmer, and Exit the Body. The casts, together with their directors, were randomly assigned to Groups I, II, III, and IV.

There were forty students involved, ranging in age from 15 to 18, with 55% male and 45% female. The level of experience ranged from 37.5% of the students who were involved in their first role in a play, 15% who were involved in their second play, 22.5% who were involved in their third play, 10% involved in their fourth play, to 15% who had participated in five or more plays.

Design of the Experimental Study

Instrumentation

The measurement utilized was a researcher-constructed questionnaire comprised of twenty-six statements about the performance behavior of the students involved (see Appendix A). For each statement, behaviors could be ranked on a scale at an interval level, with scores ranging from zero to ten. To assist the students and directors, categories were assigned to the scale: 0=never, 1-3=rarely, 4-6=sometimes, 7-9=frequently, 10=always. Cross-validating questions were utilized to verify subjects' responses.

The questionnaire began with five statements regarding verbal performance behavior. These were given in order to help control demand characteristics, that is, to prevent the possibility of participant sensitization to the purpose of the experiment which might cause them to concentrate only on their nonverbal behavior. Data from these questions were

not considered in the analysis.

The next section of the questionnaire dealt with facial expressions and hand gestures. Statements 1 and 2 rated the magnitude of facial expressions. Statements 3, 4, 6, and 8 assessed the actor's physical control in the performance of gestures. Statements 5 and 7 measured the purpose displayed in expression through gestures.

Section III concerned the actor's body movement. Statements 1, 2, and 4 evaluated the appropriateness of the actor's body movement to the portrayal of a certain character in a specific play. Statements 3 and 8 measured the motivation displayed by the body movement. Statements 5 and 6 rated the actor's ability to present a believable character and to clearly project emotions through body movement. Statements 7 and 9 assessed the actor's physical control in the performance of consistent body movement.

Section IV evaluated the actor's posture. Statements 1 and 4 rated the pertinence of the actor's posture to the depiction of a particular character. Statements 2 and 3 measured the actor's physical control of posture.

The evaluation instrument possesses face validity. Statements which did not measure performance behaviors were not included by the researcher. To minimize subjectivity, the relevance of the evaluation instrument was independently judged by three directors, thereby increasing the likelihood that the results of the study are valid and reliable.

The evaluation instrument and experimental design were

pre-tested at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee, in the final rehearsal period of two one-act plays being prepared by the Austin Peay Playhouse. The actors and directors were given the same instructions used for the high school groups. One cast received only its director's notes, and the other cast received the combination of its director's notes and videotaped feedback. After completing the procedures, actors and directors were encouraged to offer criticism and suggestions related to the questionnaires or procedures. They were also invited to pose questions related to anything that seemed ambiguous. The observations of the directors and actors and an examination of the completed questionnaires aided in the formation of a more powerful instrument.

Experimental Treatment

Four casts of high school students preparing plays were involved in the study. Each cast was randomly assigned to Groups I, II, III, or IV. The directors of each group developed for and explained to their casts their criteria for performance behavior, verbal and nonverbal. When the groups had met the requirement of having lines memorized, the field experiment began. Each group performed a twenty minute scene involving the play's climax. This scene was selected by the researcher, and the students had begun a rehearsal with this scene in the past. As the scene was executed, the directors viewed the presentation and rated each individual's performance on Questionnaire I. Students

were then asked to rate their own individual performances, using the same questionnaire format that the director had completed.

For two of the groups, a videocamera recorded the scene. Group I was not videotaped; it served as the control group for the experiment. Group I completed Questionnaire I, received no director notes or videotaped feedback, and proceeded to rehearse other segments of the play. Thirty minutes before rehearsal ended, Group I completed Questionnaire II, which utilized the same questions from the first rating involving verbal and nonverbal performance behavior. The group then performed the selected twenty minute scene again, and the director rated the second performance of the scene, using Questionnaire II for each student. Group II was not videotaped; these students completed and returned Questionnaire I. The director then gave oral notes, and the students were asked to evaluate their verbal and nonverbal performance behavior using Questionnaire II. Then the group performed the same scene again, and the director rated the second attempt. Group III repeated the same steps as Group II except, instead of the director's notes, the videotape was shown to the group without comment. Group IV completed the same procedure as Group III, except that the videotape was accompanied by the director's comments.

The researcher monitored the students in a controlled environment while they completed their evaluations in order

24
to obstruct the students from any opportunity to confer about responses to the evaluation. Completed evaluations from the directors and students were coded and recorded by computer for statistical analysis.

Method of Statistical Analysis

Computer analysis provided scores for student evaluations before and after the experimental treatment, measured by the sum of the scores assigned by the students on each questionnaire. The scores of the director evaluations before and after the treatment were provided by the computer in the same way. To find the difference in student and director evaluations before the manipulation, the student-before treatment evaluation score was subtracted from the director-before treatment evaluation score. The absolute value of that score was computed, and this became the score for the amount of difference in student and director evaluations before manipulation. The difference in student and director after the treatment was computed by subtracting the second student evaluation score, rated after manipulation, from the director's first score, then finding the absolute value of that difference. This became the score for amount of difference in director and student after treatment.

The computer also supplied scores for improvement, measured by subtracting the director evaluation of the first attempt before treatment from the director evaluation of the second attempt after the treatment.

Two statistical tests were used to test the hypotheses and tabulate data. Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted in examining hypotheses which compared the differences among the four groups. In the investigation of the hypotheses which compared director and student differences before treatment and after treatment, as well as in the examination of hypotheses which measured improvement by comparing the director evaluations of the first and second attempts, the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was conducted, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program. This test was used in place of a one-way analysis of variance with repeated measures (ANOVA) because the small sample size involved might not meet the ANOVA's assumption of normality.

Limitations of the Study

1. The author did not have control over selection of plays, assignment of students to roles in plays, or number of students involved in the plays. A random sample was not used.
2. Uncontrollable differences among groups may have influenced the results.
3. Differences in the experience and training of the high school theatre directors may have influenced the results.

CHAPTER 5

Results

Probably the most notable findings of the study compare the directors' evaluations of a first performance with the directors' evaluations of a second performance after any manipulation. Also important are the means of the students' before and after self-evaluations. The students evaluated only the first performance. These mean scores are represented in Table 1.

Table 1

Student Evaluation Before and After With
Director Evaluation Before and After in the Four Groups

	GROUP I	GROUP II	GROUP III	GROUP IV
STUDENT BEFORE MEAN SCORE	142.0	138.2	135.8	138.3
STUDENT AFTER MEAN SCORE	146.4	137.8	116.4	121.9
DIRECTOR BEFORE MEAN SCORE	137.8	171.5	143.8	131.5
DIRECTOR AFTER MEAN SCORE	128.5	179.1	149.0	135.9

As the figures in Table 1 indicate, students in Group I, which received no feedback of any kind, were the only participants whose evaluations of the first performance rose. Students in Group II, which received the director's oral comments, lowered their scores only slightly. Group III scores, after the students viewed the videotape, fell by 19.4 points. Students in Group IV, which received a combination of videotaped feedback and director's oral notes, reduced their evaluations by 16.4 points.

The director of Group I, which received no comment or feedback on its performance, scored the second attempt lower. The directors of Groups II, III, and IV scored the second attempt higher.

The first hypothesis proposed that students who received oral notes would rate their nonverbal performance behavior closer to the directors' evaluation than they did before the notes were given. The second hypothesis projected that students who received videotaped feedback would rate their nonverbal performance behavior closer to the director's rating than they did before the feedback. The fourth hypothesis stated that students would rate their nonverbal performance behavior closer to the director's rating following a combination of oral notes and videotaped feedback than they did beforehand. To investigate these hypotheses, the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was conducted. The results of the Wilcoxon Test comparing director and student differences are found in Table 2. To

determine the statistical significance of the results of this study, the probability level has been set at .05 ($p \leq .05$), which means that if the experiment were repeated 100 times, the results of the study would be based on random error or chance in only five times out of that 100. The results will be considered statistically significant if the probability is equal to or lower than the .05 level.

Table 2

Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test of Differences In
Directors' First Evaluations With Students' Evaluations
Before and After Manipulation

	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DIRECTOR & STUDENT BEFORE MANIPULATION		DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DIRECTOR & STUDENT AFTER MANIPULATION		
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	p=
GROUP I	23.3	16.2	23.8	15.2	.8939
GROUP II	40.8	35.1	38.6	34.0	.3505
GROUP III	28.3	24.1	34.1	29.7	.2076
GROUP IV	22.2	15.0	15.6	10.4	.1235

The Wilcoxon test found no significant alignment of director and student scores after manipulation, but it did show a decrease in the difference between director and student in Group II (director notes) and Group IV (combined videotaped feedback and director notes).

The third hypothesis proposed that after receiving videotaped feedback, students would rate themselves closer to the director's rating than would students who received director notes only. The fifth hypothesis stated that after receiving both videotaped feedback and director notes, students would rate themselves closer to the director's rating than those who received either videotaped feedback or director notes alone.

To examine the significance of the differences among the groups, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted. Table 3 compares the groups in sets of two, giving the significance of the ratio of variance (F ratio) for each set. The scores in Table 3 represent the difference between director and student evaluations after the manipulation for each group. The symbols in Table 3 indicate which of the two treatments being compared resulted in less difference between the director and student evaluations.

Table 3

Comparison of Alignment of Directors' and Students' Ratings
by Groups in Sets of Two

GROUPS COMPARED	MEAN DIFFERENCE SCORES AFTER MANIPULATIONS BY MANIPULATIONS	p=
I & II	NONE (23.8) < NOTES (38.6)	.20
I & III	NONE (23.8) < VIDEOTAPE (34.1)	.34
I & IV	NONE (23.8) > COMBINATION (15.6)	.17
II & III	NOTES (38.6) > VIDEOTAPE (34.1)	.77
II & IV	NOTES (38.6) > COMBINATION (15.6)	.05
III & IV	VIDEOTAPE (34.1) > COMBINATION (15.6)	.08

Scores of the differences in director and student ratings in Group I (the control group) were less after receiving no experimental treatment than the scores of Groups II (oral notes) and III (videotaped feedback). This difference was not statistically significant. Scores of the differences in director and student ratings in Group IV (combination of notes and videotaped feedback) were less than that of Group I (the control group), but this did not achieve statistical significance. Scores of the differences in Group IV (combination of notes and videotape) were less than the differences in Group III (videotaped feedback), but the difference was not quite significant. When compared

to Group II (oral notes alone), the difference in Group IV (combination of notes and videotaped feedback) was less, and it achieved statistical significance.

Hypothesis six proposed that when the selected scene is performed following the director's oral notes, the director would increase the scores on the second evaluation. Hypothesis seven suggested that following videotaped feedback, the ratings made by the director would be higher than those made by the same director on the first evaluation. Hypothesis nine stated that following a combination of director's notes and videotaped feedback, the ratings made by the director would be higher than those made by the same director on the first evaluation. To measure improvement in the second performance, required by these three hypotheses, the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test was conducted. The results are given in Table 4.

Table 4

Wilcoxon Test of Directors' Evaluations After Manipulation
With Evaluations Before Manipulation

	DIRECTOR BEFORE EVALUATION		DIRECTOR AFTER EVALUATION		p=
	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	
GROUP I	137.8	14.3	128.5	11.9	.0051
GROUP II	171.5	20.3	179.1	13.7	.0684
GROUP III	143.8	40.7	149.0	41.2	.1834
GROUP IV	131.5	25.3	135.9	25.7	.0284

The Wilcoxon test comparing the first and second directors' evaluations found that the director of the control group scored the second performance significantly lower. Although the scores improved in both the second and third group, the improvement was not significant. The Wilcoxon Test found significant improvement in the combination of director notes and videotaped feedback used in Group IV.

According to hypothesis eight, after videotaped feedback is used, improvement indicated by higher ratings in the director's second evaluation will be greater than the improvement indicated in the second evaluation of the director who gave notes only. Hypothesis ten proposed that improvement after a combination of videotaped feedback and notes is used, indicated by higher ratings in the director's

second evaluation, will be greater than the improvement indicated in the second evaluations of the directors who used either method by itself. The last two hypotheses to be investigated compare the effectiveness of each method among the groups. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted, and comparisons of the groups in sets of two, together with the significance of the ratio of variance (F ratio) for each set, are found in Table 5.

Table 5

Comparison of Effectiveness of Methods In Improving
Second Rehearsal Attempts

GROUPS COMPARED	DIFFERENCES IN DIRECTOR EVALUATION AFTER MANIPULATION BY MANIPULATIONS	p=
I & II	NONE (-9.27) < NOTES (7.55)	.00
I & III	NONE (-9.27) < VIDEOTAPE (5.25)	.00
I & IV	NONE (-9.27) < COMBINATION (4.40)	.00
II & III	NOTES (7.55) > VIDEOTAPE (5.25)	.64
II & IV	NOTES (7.55) > COMBINATION (4.40)	.43
III & IV	VIDEOTAPE (5.25) > COMBINATION (4.40)	.80

The results given in Table 5 indicate that each of the three experimental treatments were effective when compared

to the control group, with each achieving statistical significance. However, when Groups II, III, and IV were compared to each other, none was statistically significantly better than the group below it. Additional tables of ANOVA results may be found in Appendix B.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

Discussion

Learning to evaluate their own performances and utilizing their own evaluations to improve their performance behaviors are two vital tasks for high school students involved in theatre productions. Students who received no feedback on their performance behavior evaluated themselves higher in a second evaluation of the same attempt, a direct contradiction to all other groups involved in the study. Every other group became more critical in the second evaluation. Certain inferences may be made concerning this second evaluation. First, without any videotaped feedback or director notes, students tend to be more content with their nonverbal performance behavior. Second, although director notes lowered the scores of the second evaluation, the difference was slight (only .4 points). Third, the large decrease in the group which saw the videotape did not decrease the difference in the director and students' evaluations; in fact, the difference increased. This large difference may be evidence of a type of "shocked" response. Without a director to guide their feedback, the students see only the mistakes and fail to appreciate the correctly performed behaviors. This problem might be solved by repeated exposure to videotaped feedback; however, some

students might become discouraged before they become adjusted to the feedback. Therefore, using videotaped feedback alone is not advised. The group which received both the videotaped feedback and the director notes had the largest decrease in the difference of director and student evaluations. This confirms the need for the director to assist the students by positively reenforcing correct behavior while attempting to modify incorrect behaviors. These results may also encourage high school directors to utilize videotaped feedback and director notes as a teaching tool. Although no significant decrease was found in the differences in any group, differences did decline in the group with director notes and in the group which combines notes and videotape. However, the first, second, and fourth hypotheses, which proposed that the manipulations would result in decreased differences in director and students' evaluations were not confirmed with statistically significant results.

The third hypothesis concerned the effectiveness of videotaped feedback when compared to director notes alone. Its proposal that videotaped feedback would cause the students to evaluate themselves closer to the director evaluation than students who received notes alone was not confirmed. The fifth hypothesis, which compared the effectiveness of a combination of notes and videotaped feedback to either method alone, proposed that the combination would be more effective than either method

alone. Although the difference was lower after the combination than after either method alone, the difference was not quite statistically significant when comparing videotape alone with the combination. There was, however, a statistically significantly lower difference after the combination method than after the use of notes alone.

Improvement was shown by higher director ratings on the second attempted performance than on the first attempt. Hypothesis six stated that this would occur following director notes. Improvement did occur, but was not statistically significant. Hypothesis seven proposed that the director rating would increase following videotaped feedback. It did increase, but the increase was not statistically significant. Hypothesis nine stated that following a combination of director notes and videotaped feedback, the ratings made by the director would be higher than those made by the same director on the first evaluation. This was confirmed with statistical significance.

Hypotheses eight and ten concerned the effectiveness of the experimental treatments in improving the director evaluation of a second rehearsal attempt. Hypothesis eight proposed that videotaped feedback would cause greater improvement than director notes would cause. Hypothesis ten stated that a combination of videotaped feedback and director notes would cause greater improvement than either videotaped feedback or notes alone would cause. Neither of

these hypotheses was confirmed.

Implications for High School Theatre Directors

There are times when high school theatre directors must wonder whether their efforts to teach and to produce a work of art are in vain. The repeated problems, covered in director notes at each rehearsal, frustrate directors and actors alike. This can lead both directors and actors to become discouraged, stifling the success of the rehearsal process. This problem occurs in numerous high school theatre programs; however, little research has been done to aid directors in their attempts to solve this problem.

The information discovered in this study indicates that students need assistance in improving their own performances. Perhaps the most reassuring results of this study indicate that any of the tested methods used by the director is significantly better than no method at all. The study also found that without any director notes or videotaped feedback the director evaluation indicated that the second attempt was significantly worse. This directly answers a question widely raised by high school theatre instructors: "Are my efforts making any difference at all?"

More importantly, this study shows that a combination of videotaped feedback and director notes is significantly effective in improving the director evaluation of a second attempt. This combination was also able to significantly lower the difference in director and student evaluations more than the use of director notes alone. Furthermore, the

results of the study indicate that high school theatre directors should utilize a combination of videotaped feedback and oral notes in rehearsal sessions.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study established that a combination of videotaped feedback and director notes is significantly effective in improving the director evaluation of nonverbal performance behavior in a second rehearsal attempt and that this combination significantly lowers the difference in director and student evaluations of nonverbal performance behavior more than the use of director notes alone.

Could the use of videotaped feedback and director notes help students improve their performances in areas other than nonverbal performance behaviors? Students might be able to benefit more from this method in some areas of performance behaviors than others. Further research might discover other uses for the combination of videotaped feedback and director notes.

How regularly should a director use a combination of videotaped feedback and oral notes? This method does require more time than oral notes. At some point, students might lose valuable time needed for other methods of instruction. Research in this area could determine the most productive ways to use this method.

Could repeated exposure to a combination of videotaped feedback and oral notes increase the effectiveness of videotaped feedback or oral notes alone? If the use of this

combination heightens objectivity and increases self-awareness, the students might actually benefit more from the use of either treatment alone after repeated exposure to the combination.

Would repeated exposure to a combination of videotaped feedback and oral notes lead students to become self-correcting? The ultimate goal of the use of a combination of videotaped feedback and director notes would be to encourage students to develop their talents to their full potential.

This study has shown that the combination of videotaped feedback and director notes is a significantly effective method of addressing the issue of nonverbal performance behavior in high school instructional theatre. Videotaped feedback combined with director notes can be a rewarding method of teaching nonverbal performance skills and producing artistic presentations. The use of videotaped feedback and director notes could become an integral part of instructional theatre at the high school level. With further research and experimentation, high school theatre directors could achieve significant new levels of instruction and produce art-works of distinction.

REFERENCES

- Albright, Hardie. Stage Direction in Transition. Encino: Dickinson Publishing, 1972.
- Allen, John. Drama In Schools: Its Theory and Practice. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1979.
- Atencio, Benjamin. "An Enthusiasm To Learn through Video." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (1987): 632-34.
- Ball, William. A Sense of Direction. New York: Drama Book Publishers, 1984.
- Barnouw, Erik, gen. ed. International Encyclopedia of Communications. 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.
- Beck, Roy, et al. Play Production Today. Skokie: National Textbook Company, 1983.
- Birdwhistell, Ray L. Kinesics and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.
- Bowman, Connie L. "So You Want To Be in Pictures: Videotaping in the Foreign Language Classroom." Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association Journal Dec. 1985: 21-27.
- Decker, Phillip J. "The Effects of Rehearsal Group Size and Video Feedback in Behavior Modeling Training." Personnel Psychology 36 (1983): 763-73.
- Frantz, Alice Humby. "Audience Response to Interpersonal Distance in Live and in Videotaped Theatre Scenes and Its Implications for Teaching Methodology." DAI 42 (1981): 1853A. U of Florida.

- Herbert, James, gen. ed. Academic Preparation In the Arts.
New York: College Board Publications, 1985.
- Morris, Desmond. Manwatching: A Field Guide To Human Behavior. New York: Abrams, 1977.
- Pierpont, Margaret. "Dance Training in the Video Age."
Dance Magazine 54 (1980): 68-70.
- Reider, William L. "VCRs Silently Take Over the Classroom."
TechTrends Nov.-Dec. 1985: 14-18.
- Rogers, Sandra. "If I Can See Myself, I Can Change."
Educational Leadership 45 (1987): 64-67.
- Scherer, Klaus R. and Paul Ekman, eds. Handbook of Methods in Nonverbal Behavior Research. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Schuley, Marcia R. "The Effectiveness of a Self-Directed Manual, Behavioral Rehearsal and Lecture-Discussion in Training College Students for the Employment Interview." DAI 41 (1980): 2945A. Kansas State U.
- Snyder, Joan, and Michael Drumsta. The Dynamics of Acting. Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company, 1981.
- Spiegel, John, and Pavel Machotka. Messages of the Body. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- Wallach, Susan Levi. "Live On Tape: Resident Theatres as Video Producers." Theatre Crafts Oct. 1981: 26-30.
- Wheetley, Kim. National Theatre Education Project - A Model Drama/Theatre Curriculum: Philosophy, Goals and Objectives. New Orleans: Anchorage Press, 1987.

Wolfgang, Aaron, gen. ed. Nonverbal Behavior: Applications and Cultural Implications. New York: Academic Press, Incorporated, 1979.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

I. The questionnaires for the directors and actors utilized the same questions with different headings and instructions. Therefore, the alternate headings and instructions are given immediately following this instrument.

QUESTIONNAIRE I

ACTOR'S NUMBER _____

IN HOW MANY PLAYS HAVE YOU PERFORMED
(INCLUDING THIS ONE)? _____

DIRECTIONS: EVALUATE YOUR INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE IN THE SCENE YOU HAVE JUST COMPLETED BY CIRCLING THE WORD, THEN THE NUMERICAL RATING, WHICH MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFY YOUR PERFORMANCE IN EACH AREA BELOW:

I. Voice

1. Actor changes volume to suit meaning of lines.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

2. Actor changes tone of voice to suit line.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

3. Actor delivers lines at appropriate pace.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

4. Actor delivers line with appropriate emphasis.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

5. Actor can be heard by every member of the audience.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

II. Facial and Hand Gestures

1. Actor's facial expressions are magnified enough to be meaningful to the vast majority of the audience.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

2. Actor's facial expressions are so large that they are overdone.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

3. Actor's gestures appear relaxed.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

4. Actor's gestures seem awkward because of insufficient control.

0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS

5. Actor's gestures are expressive.

0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS

6. Actor's gestures are complete, not half-performed.

0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS

7. Actor's gestures lack purpose.

0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS

8. Actor's gestures are fluid.

0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS

III. Body Movement

1. Actor displays personal mannerisms that do not suit the character.

0	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9	10
NEVER	RARELY	SOMETIMES	FREQUENTLY	ALWAYS

2. Actor's body movement is pertinent to particular character being portrayed.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

3. Actor's body movement is meaningless.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

4. Actor's body movement is used in correct context of the play.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

5. Actor clearly projects emotion through bodily action to an audience.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

6. Actor's body movement contributes to a believable character portrayal.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

7. Actor effects counter (cross) movements without calling attention to movement.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

8. Actor's body movement is motivated.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

9. Actor's body movement is consistent.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

IV. Posture

1. Actor's posture reveals character's age.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

2. Actor's posture distracts audience's attention.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

3. Actor's torso appears stiff.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY			SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS

4. Actor's posture reveals character's state of health.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER	RARELY		SOMETIMES			FREQUENTLY			ALWAYS	

II. Headings and Instructions:

A. DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE I

The headings and instructions read:

DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE I

DIRECTIONS: ON THE ANSWER FORM, EVALUATE EACH INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE IN THE SCENE YOU HAVE JUST COMPLETED BY INDICATING, BY EACH ACTOR'S NAME, THE NUMERICAL RATING WHICH MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFIES THE ACTOR'S PERFORMANCE IN EACH AREA BELOW:

B. ACTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE II

The headings and instruction read:

QUESTIONNAIRE II ACTOR'S NUMBER _____

DIRECTIONS: EVALUATE AGAIN YOUR INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE IN THE SAME SCENE YOU PREVIOUSLY EVALUATED. CIRCLE THE WORD, THEN THE NUMERICAL RATING, WHICH MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFY YOUR PERFORMANCE IN EACH AREA BELOW:

C. DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE II

The headings and instructions read:

DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE II

DIRECTIONS: ON THE ANSWER FORM, EVALUATE EACH INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE IN THE SCENE YOU HAVE JUST COMPLETED BY INDICATING, BY EACH ACTOR'S NAME, THE NUMERICAL RATING WHICH MOST CLOSELY IDENTIFIES THE ACTOR'S PERFORMANCE IN EACH AREA BELOW:

APPENDIX B

Analysis of Variance Tables

Table 6

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups I and II

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	1207.682	1	1207.682	1.740	.20
Residual	13878.182	20	693.909		
Total	15085.864	21	718.374		

Number of cases = 22

Table 7

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups I and III

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	492.015	1	492.015	.983	.34
Residual	8506.511	17	500.383		
Total	8998.526	18	499.918		

Number of cases = 19

Table 8

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences
In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups I and IV

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	353.773	1	353.773	2.037	.17
Residual	3300.036	19	173.686		
Total	3653.810	20	182.690		

Number of cases = 21

Table 9

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In
Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups II and III

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	94.264	1	94.264	.090	.77
Residual	17745.420	17	1043.848		
Total	17839.684	18	991.094		

Number of cases = 19

Table 10

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences
In Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups II and IV

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	2779.721	1	2779.721	4.212	.05
Residual	12538.945	19	659.944		
Total	15318.667	20	765.933		

Number of cases = 21

Table 11

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Differences In
Director and Student Evaluations Between Groups III and IV

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	1525.225	1	1525.225	3.405	.08
Residual	7167.275	16	447.955		
Total	8692.500	17	511.324		

Number of cases = 18

Table 12

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement
Between Groups I and II

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	1555.682	1	1555.682	20.841	.00
Residual	1492.909	20	74.645		
Total	3048.591	21	145.171		
Number of cases = 22					

Table 13

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement
Between Groups I and III

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	976.844	1	976.844	21.083	.00
Residual	787.682	17	46.334		
Total	1764.526	18	98.029		
Number of cases = 19					

Table 14

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement
Between Groups I and IV

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	979.228	1	979.228	36.439	.00
Residual	510.582	19	26.873		
Total	1489.810	20	74.490		

Number of cases = 21

Table 15

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement
Between Groups II and III

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	24.404	1	24.404	.234	.64
Residual	1776.227	17	104.484		
Total	1800.632	18	100.035		

Number of cases = 19

Table 16

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement
Between Groups II and IV

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	51.825	1	51.825	.657	.43
Residual	1499.127	19	78.901		
Total	1550.952	20	77.548		
Number of cases = 21					

Table 17

Analysis of Variance of Post-Treatment Improvement
Between Groups III and IV

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Treatment	3.211	1	3.211	.065	.80
Residual	793.900	16	49.619		
Total	797.111	17	46.889		
Number of cases = 18					